

REMARKS

Claims 43, 45-47, 52-54, 56, 59-60, and 62-79 will be pending in the subject application upon entry of the present amendment. Claims 43, 46, 52, 54, 59-60, 65-66, and 69-71 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-5 of the Reply. Claims 47 and 56 are canceled; and claims 44, 48-51, 55, 57-58, and 61 were previously canceled. New claims 72-79 are added. No new matter has been added.

Assignee's representative appreciates Examiner Kasraian's courtesies extended during the teleconference held on January 11, 2011, with Keith Drabek. During the teleconference, the 35 U.S.C. § 112 and 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections were discussed, in light of proposed amendments to independent claims 43, 52, and 59; though no particular agreement was reached regarding a particular amendment without further search and consideration.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 43, 45-47, 52-54, 56, 59-60, and 62-71 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 43, 45-47, 52-54, 56, 59-60, and 62-71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Further, the subject claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection should be withdrawn in view of the amendments to claims 43, 52, and 59 made herein.

For example, amended independent claim 43 now recites *a switch configured to: receive information of a call directed to a telephone number assigned to a digital cordless handset and a cellular telephone number ... and a signal transfer component: ... configured to, based on the termination attempt trigger: maintain the call via the mobile switching center and release the call via the wireless access point in response to the call being answered via the cellular telephone, and maintain the call via the wireless access point and release the call via the mobile switching center in response to the call being answered via the digital cordless handset*; amended independent claim 52 now recites *a method, comprising: ... generating a termination attempt trigger in response to receiving a call directed to a telephone number of a digital cordless handset associated with the*

locally disbursed wireless network and a cellular telephone associated with the cellular network; ... routing the call to the mobile switching center and releasing the call via the wireless access point in response to the call being answered via the cellular telephone; and routing the call to the wireless access point and releasing the call via the mobile switching center in response to the call being answered via the digital cordless handset; and amended independent claim 59 now recites *a switch configured to: receive information of a call directed to a telephone number of a cellular telephone associated with a cellular network and a digital cordless handset associated with a locally distributed wireless network; ... route the call to the cellular telephone and drop the call to the digital cordless handset in response to the call being answered via the cellular telephone and; and route the call to the digital cordless handset and drop the call to the cellular telephone in response to the call being answered via the digital cordless handset.*

Support for such amendments can be found in Assignee's specification at least at paragraph [0059], which describes "[i]n order to provide the functionality described herein for utilizing a single telephone number with multiple handsets, an interface is provided between the networks 110 and 112 and the PSTN 116. In particular, the media gateway 246 interfaces with a signal transfer point (STP) 24 via a communication link. The communication link may employ, for example, the signaling system 7 (SS7) switching protocol. The STP 24 may be a multi-port high speed packet switch that is programmed to respond to the routing information in the appropriate layer of the switching protocol and to route the data packets to their intended destinations. The MSC 272 of the network 112 may also similarly be connected to the STP 504 via a communication link."

Further, paragraph [0062] of Assignee's specification describes "[t]he features of the PSTN 116 illustrated in FIG. 5 include a services node (SN) 508. The SN 508 may be, for example, a compact services node available from LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES, although the SN 508 may be any other type of available AIN-compliant SN. The SN 508 may be connected to one or more of the SSP switches via a communications link which may be, for example, an integrated service digital network (ISDN) connection, including basic rate interface or primary rate interface lines. According to other embodiments, the communications link may be, for example, a T1 trunk circuit. The SN 508 may be used primarily when some enhanced feature or service is needed that requires an audio connection to the call such as, for example, the call

return and calling name services. Similar to the SCP 506, the intelligent functionality of the SN 508 may be realized by programmable applications executable by the SN 508.”

Furthermore, paragraph [0065] of Assignee’s specification describes “[w]hen a call is received and directed to a single telephone number, a termination attempt trigger is generated at the central office 245. In response thereto, a message is transmitted to the SCP 506 requesting further instructions on the handling of the incoming communication. Based on the content of the database stored at the SCP 506, the incoming communication is routed to the SN 508.”

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 43, 52, 54, 56, 63-66, 69, and 70 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 43, 52, 54, 56, 63-66, 69, and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on O’Neil *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,963,864) and Rogalski *et al.* (US Patent Publication No. 2004/0141484). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: O’Neil *et al.* and Rogalski *et al.* do not teach or suggest each and every element recited in the subject claims.

The subject application generally relates to providing service(s) to wireless device(s) via wireless access point(s). Aspects of the subject application can include assigning a single telephone number to two or more handsets, each of which may be operated in a different telecommunications network. For example, when a call is initiated to the single telephone number, both a handset operable for use with an IEEE 802.11b wireless network and a handset operable for use with a cellular network can be rung. Either handset may then be used to receive the call. (See *e.g.* the subject application at paragraph [0053]). To these and other related ends, independent claim 43, as amended, recites *a switch configured to: receive information of a call directed to a telephone number assigned to a digital cordless handset and a cellular telephone number ... and a signal transfer component: ... configured to, based on the termination attempt trigger: maintain the call via the mobile switching center and release the call via the wireless access point in response to the call being answered via the cellular telephone, and maintain the call via the wireless access point and release the call via the mobile switching center in response to the call being answered via the digital cordless handset.* (See *e.g.* the subject application at paragraphs [0065] – [0066]).

O'neil *et al.* generally relates to providing a telecommunication extension service to a subscriber with at least a first unit having a first number and a second unit having a second number (see O'neil *et al.* at Abstract); and Rogalski *et al.* generally relates to providing wireless communications between a cellular telephone and a landline telephone utilizing Bluetooth (see Rogalski *et al.* at paragraph [0021]); however, neither O'neil *et al.* nor Rogalski *et al.* teach or suggest at least *a signal transfer component: ... configured to, based on the termination attempt trigger: maintain the call via the mobile switching center and release the call via the wireless access point in response to the call being answered via the cellular telephone, and maintain the call via the wireless access point and release the call via the mobile switching center in response to the call being answered via the digital cordless handset*, as recited in amended claim 43.

Further, neither O'neil *et al.* nor Rogalski *et al.* teach or suggest at least *a method, comprising: ... generating a termination attempt trigger in response to receiving a call directed to a telephone number of a digital cordless handset associated with the locally disbursed wireless network and a cellular telephone associated with the cellular network; ... routing the call to the mobile switching center and releasing the call via the wireless access point in response to the call being answered via the cellular telephone; and routing the call to the wireless access point and releasing the call via the mobile switching center in response to the call being answered via the digital cordless handset*, as recited in amended independent claim 52.

Furthermore, neither O'neil *et al.* nor Rogalski *et al.* teach or suggest at least *a switch configured to: receive information of a call directed to a telephone number of a cellular telephone associated with a cellular network and a digital cordless handset associated with a locally distributed wireless network; ... route the call to the cellular telephone and drop the call to the digital cordless handset in response to the call being answered via the cellular telephone and; and route the call to the digital cordless handset and drop the call to the cellular telephone in response to the call being answered via the digital cordless handset*, as recited in amended independent claim 59. Rather, O'neil *et al.* discloses "use of one or more telecommunication units (each with their own numbers) as extensions to a specified telecommunication unit" (see O'neil *et al.* at col. 6, lines 62-67); and Rogalski *et al.* merely discloses a cellular telephone in communication with a cordless telephone base station including

a Bluetooth transceiver. (See Rogalski *et al.* at paragraph [0011]).

Accordingly, O’neil *et al.* and Rogalski *et al.* do not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 43, 52, 54, 56, 63-66, 69, and 70, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 45 and 46 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 45 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on O’neil *et al.*, Rogalski *et al.*, and Arazi *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2008/0026775). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: O’neil *et al.*, Rogalski *et al.*, and Arazi *et al.* do not teach or suggest each and every element recited in claims 45 and 46.

In this regard, O’neil *et al.*, Rogalski *et al.*, and Arazi *et al.* do not teach or suggest at least *a switch configured to: receive information of a call directed to a telephone number assigned to a digital cordless handset and a cellular telephone number ... and a signal transfer component: ... configured to, based on the termination attempt trigger: maintain the call via the mobile switching center and release the call via the wireless access point in response to the call being answered via the cellular telephone, and maintain the call via the wireless access point and release the call via the mobile switching center in response to the call being answered via the digital cordless handset*, as recited in amended independent claim 43. Instead, O’neil *et al.* discloses “use of one or more telecommunication units (each with their own numbers) as extensions to a specified telecommunication unit” (see O’neil *et al.* at col. 6, lines 62-67); Rogalski *et al.* merely discloses a cellular telephone in communication with a cordless telephone base station including a Bluetooth transceiver; and Arazi *et al.* merely discloses handing off calls from one base station to another base station. (See Arazi *et al.* at paragraph [0027]).

Accordingly, O’neil *et al.*, Rogalski *et al.*, and Arazi *et al.* do not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 45 and 46; and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 47 and 53 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 47 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on O’neil *et al.*, Rogalski *et al.*, and Kallio (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0147008). This rejection should be

withdrawn for at least the following reason: O’neil *et al.*, Rogalski *et al.*, and Kallio do not teach or suggest each and every element recited in claims 47 and 53.

In this regard, O’neil *et al.*, Rogalski *et al.*, and Kallio do not teach or suggest at least *a switch configured to: receive information of a call directed to a telephone number assigned to a digital cordless handset and a cellular telephone number ... and a signal transfer component: ... configured to, based on the termination attempt trigger: maintain the call via the mobile switching center and release the call via the wireless access point in response to the call being answered via the cellular telephone, and maintain the call via the wireless access point and release the call via the mobile switching center in response to the call being answered via the digital cordless handset*, as recited in amended claim 43; and O’neil *et al.*, Rogalski *et al.*, and Kallio do not teach or suggest at least *a method, comprising: ... generating a termination attempt trigger in response to receiving a call directed to a telephone number of a digital cordless handset associated with the locally disbursed wireless network and a cellular telephone associated with the cellular network; ... routing the call to the mobile switching center and releasing the call via the wireless access point in response to the call being answered via the cellular telephone; and routing the call to the wireless access point and releasing the call via the mobile switching center in response to the call being answered via the digital cordless handset*, as recited in amended independent claim 52.

Rather, O’neil *et al.* discloses “use of one or more telecommunication units (each with their own numbers) as extensions to a specified telecommunication unit” (see O’neil *et al.* at col. 6, lines 62-67); Rogalski *et al.* merely discloses a cellular telephone in communication with a cordless telephone base station including a Bluetooth transceiver; and Kallio merely discloses a dual-mode device can roam between a Global System for Mobile (GSM) communication network and a wireless local area network (WLAN). (See Kallio at paragraph [0025]).

Accordingly, O’neil *et al.*, Rogalski *et al.*, and Kallio do not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 47 and 53; and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 59, 67, 68, and 71 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 59, 67, 68, and 71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on O’neil *et al.* and Kallio. This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: O’neil *et al.*

and Kallio do not teach or suggest each and every element recited in claims 59, 67, 68, and 71.

As described above, O'neil *et al.* generally relates to providing a telecommunication extension service to a subscriber with at least a first unit having a first number and a second unit having a second number; and Kallio discloses a dual-mode device can roam between a GSM network and a WLAN; however, neither O'neil *et al.* nor Kallio teach or suggest at least *a switch configured to: receive information of a call directed to a telephone number of a cellular telephone associated with a cellular network and a digital cordless handset associated with a locally distributed wireless network; ... route the call to the cellular telephone and drop the call to the digital cordless handset in response to the call being answered via the cellular telephone and; and route the call to the digital cordless handset and drop the call to the cellular telephone in response to the call being answered via the digital cordless handset*, as recited in amended independent claim 59.

Accordingly, O'neil *et al.* and Kallio do not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 59, 67, 68, and 71; and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claim 62 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 62 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on O'neil *et al.*, Kallio, and Jones *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,404,764). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: O'neil *et al.*, Kallio, and Jones *et al.* do not teach or suggest each and every element recited in claim 62.

In this regard, O'neil *et al.*, Kallio, and Jones *et al.* do not teach or suggest at least *a switch configured to: receive information of a call directed to a telephone number of a cellular telephone associated with a cellular network and a digital cordless handset associated with a locally distributed wireless network; ... route the call to the cellular telephone and drop the call to the digital cordless handset in response to the call being answered via the cellular telephone and; and route the call to the digital cordless handset and drop the call to the cellular telephone in response to the call being answered via the digital cordless handset*, as recited in amended independent claim 59. Rather, O'neil *et al.* discloses "use of one or more telecommunication units (each with their own numbers) as extensions to a specified telecommunication unit" (see O'neil *et al.* at col. 6, lines 62-67); Kallio merely discloses a dual-

mode device can roam between a GSM network and a WLAN; and Jones *et al.* merely discloses proving mobility between a GSM network and a wireless LAN. (See Jones *et al.* at paragraph [0024].)

Accordingly, O’Neil *et al.*, Kallio, and Jones *et al.* do not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 62; and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

VII. Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 43, 45, 47, 52-54, 56, 59, 60, and 62-67 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1, 4, 7-12, 14-18, 23-32, and 34-41 of U.S. Patent No. 7,657,270. Assignee’s representative respectfully requests the double patenting rejections be held in abeyance until such time as the subject claims are deemed allowable, as amendments that may occur during prosecution may render the double patenting rejections moot.

VIII. New Claims

New claims 72-79 are newly presented and present additional elements that patentably define over the cited art. For instance, new claim 72 recites *a service switching point switch configured to send, in response to the termination attempt trigger, a query to a service control point*; new claim 73 recites *the service control point is configured to: interrogate a database of a public switched telephone network based on the query; and determine whether the call is associated with a dialup telephone service*; new claim 74 recites *the service switching point switch is further configured to format the query according to a signaling system 7 protocol*; new claim 75 recites *the locally disbursed wireless network is associated with at least one of an Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers 802.11b network or a Bluetooth network*; new claim 76 recites *the cellular network is associated with at least one of a global system for mobile communications network or a general packet radio service network*; new claim 77 recites *the locally distributed wireless network includes at least one of an Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers 802.11b network or a Bluetooth network*; new claim 78 recites *the cellular network includes at least one of a global system for mobile communications network or a general packet radio service network*; and new claim 79 recites *the signal transfer component is communicatively coupled to at least one of the wireless access point or the*

mobile switching center utilizing a signaling system 7 switching protocol.

In contrast, as described above, O'neil *et al.* discloses "use of one or more telecommunication units (each with their own numbers) as extensions to a specified telecommunication unit" (see O'neil *et al.* at col. 6, lines 62-67); Rogalski *et al.* merely discloses a cellular telephone in communication with a cordless telephone base station including a Bluetooth transceiver; Kallio merely discloses a dual-mode device can roam between a Global System for Mobile communication (GSM) network and a wireless local area network (WLAN) (see Kallio at paragraph [0025]); and Jones *et al.* merely discloses proving mobility between a GSM network and a wireless LAN. (See Jones *et al.* at paragraph [0024]).

CONCLUSION

Assignee's representative submits this Reply addresses all of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [ATTWP290USB].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact Assignee's undersigned representative at (216) 696-8730.

Respectfully submitted,
TUROCY & WATSON, LLP

/Keith E. Drabek/
Keith E. Drabek
Reg. No. 60,757

AT&T Legal Department – T&W
Attn: Patent Docketing
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921